Training Design and Two-stage Channel Estimation for Correlated Two-way MIMO Relay Systems

Huiming Chen
Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering
the University of Hong Kong
Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong, China
Email: hmchen@eee.hku.hk

Wong Hing Lam
Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering
the University of Hong Kong
Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong, China
Email: whlam@eee.hku.hk

arXiv:1606.02433v1 [cs.IT] 8 Jun 2016

***Abstract*—This paper addresses the training signal design for the channel estimation in two-way multiple-input-and-multiple-output (MIMO) relay systems, where the channels are correlated. We first derive the backward channel estimator with the optimal training signal sent by the relay node. Given the estimated backward channels and the probabilistic knowledge of the estimation error, we mainly focus on the forward channel estimation and the related training signal design. We further propose a novel training signal. The design criterion is to minimize the relaxation of the total mean square error (MSE) of the forward channel estimators, which is conditioned on the estimated backward channels. Finally, the numerical results show that the proposed training signal can improve the MSE performance.**

I. Introduction

Relay deployed in wireless systems, where the source sends information to the destination through the relay, has been extensively investigated in recent years. It can improve the performance of long range transmission and increase the system capacity [1], [2]. Three relay assited retransmission protocols are widely used, which are amplify-and-forward (AF), decode-and-forward (DF) and compress-and-forward (CF). Among the three retransmission protocols, AF is the simplest and amplifies and re-transmits the received signal to the destination node.

For the one-way AF relay systems (OWARS), the channel estimation algorithms have been widely studied in [3]- [6]. In [3], the least-square (LS) and the linear minimum mean square error (LMMSE) estimators for the channels are respectively derived, where the optimal training signals for the two estimation schemes are also respectively proposed by minimizing the MSE of the estimators. In [4], the Bayesian estimation method is employed to derive the individual channel estimators, where the author assumes that the first hop channel is a Rician fading channel and the second hop channel is a Rayleigh fading channel. However, the estimation scheme cannot be applied directly in the systems where the first hop channels are Rayleigh fading channels. In [5], the forward-link-quadratic (FlinQ) estimation scheme is proposed to obtain the partial channel state information (CSI), which is used for the optimization of the precoder at the source node in [7]. In [6], the singular value decomposition (SVD) based maximum likelihood (ML) method is proposed to derive the composite channel estimator. Furthermore, the two-stage training based SVD-ML scheme is used to derive the individual channel estimators.

For a two-way AF relay system (TWARS), the relay node receives signals simultaneously sent from multiple source nodes and retransmits the mixed signal to the specific destination node. Therefore, the TWARS is more spectrum efficient compared to that of OWARS. The composite channel estimation in two-way MIMO relay systems has been derived by using LMMSE method in [8]. The optimal training signal is proposed with the criterion of the MSE of the estimators. Superimposed training signals and two-stage channel estimation have been proposed in [9], where the Golden section search (GSS) is applied to find the optimal training signals. Maximum a posteriori (MAP) scheme has been proposed for both the composite and individual channel estimation in [10].

In this paper, we propose a two-stage channel estimation scheme which combines LS and LMMSE methods to obtain the individual channel estimators. We assume that the two-way AF relay channels are correlated Rayleigh fading channels. At the first stage where the relay sends two training signals to the source nodes, the LS method is applied to obtain the backward channel estimators. Given the estimated backward channels, the LMMSE method is employed to derive the forward channel estimators. In particularly, the total MSE of the forward channel estimators is calculated. It should be noted that the MSE is conditioned on the estimated backward channel. We also assume that the relay power is high enough that the MSE is tightly approximated. Therefore, the optimization is conducted by minimizing the upper bound of the approximated MSE. Subsequently, the structure for the novel training signal is derived. Hence, the optimization is further simplified and the two-loop bisection search method is applied to find the training signal. The numerical results show that the MSE performance of the estimators with the proposed training scheme is improved.

The remaining paper is organized as follows. Section II describes the system model. The two-stage channel estimation is introduced in section III. Section IV describes the optimization of the training signal. Numerical results are provided in section V to verify the channel estimation and training algorithm. The



Fig. 1. Two-way MIMO relay system model.

conclusion is in section VI.

Notation: we use lower case normal font, upper case bold font and lower case bold font to denote scalars, matrices and vectors, respectively. The superscript $(\cdot)^T$, $(\cdot)^H$, $(\cdot)^{-1}$ and $(\cdot)^*$ denote transpose, Hermitian or conjugate transpose, matrix inversion and conjugate respectively. Trace of a matrix, expectation of random variables and vecterization operator are respectively signified by $\mathrm{Tr}(\cdot)$, $\mathbb{E}(\cdot), \mathrm{vec}(\cdot)$. Symbol $\otimes$ stands for the Kronecker product. $blkdiag\{\cdot\}$ is a block diagonal matrix. For two Hermitian matrices, $\mathbf{A} \succ \mathbf{B}$ means that $\mathbf{A}-\mathbf{B}$ is a positive definite matrix.

II. System Model

Consider a three nodes and two hops TWARS as is shown in Fig.1, the source nodes $\mathbb{S}_1$ and $\mathbb{S}_2$ exchange messages with one another through a relay node $\mathbb{R}$, where $\mathbb{S}_i$ are equiped with $N_i, i = 1, 2$ antenans and $\mathbb{R}$ is equipped with N_r antennas. The channel estimation scheme is conducted in two stages. The first stage requires one time slot and the relay node $\mathbb{R}$ transmits two same training signals $\mathbf{X}_R \in \mathbb{C}^{N_r \times L_r}$ to the source node $\mathbb{S}_i$ through the backward channel $\mathbf{H}_{ir} \in \mathbb{C}^{N_i \times Nr}$. In this paper, we assume the correlated channel $\mathbf{H}_{ir}$ satisfy the Gaussian-Kronecker model and therefore we can rewrite the channel matrix as $\mathbf{H}_{ir} = \mathbf{\Psi}_{ir}^{1/2}\mathbf{H}_{ir,u}\mathbf{\Phi}_{ir}^{1/2}$, where $\mathbf{\Psi}_{ir}$ is the receive correlation matrix and $\mathbf{\Phi}_{ir}$ is the transmit correlation matrix. $\mathbf{H}_{ir,u}$ is a complex Gaussian random matrix with independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) zero mean and unit variance entries. Thus, the received signal $\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_i \in \mathbb{C}^{N_i \times L_r}$ at $\mathbb{S}_i$ is given by:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_i = \mathbf{H}_{ir}\mathbf{X}_R + \tilde{\mathbf{V}}_i \tag{1}$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}_i \in \mathbb{C}^{N_i \times L_r}$ is the noise at $\mathbb{S}_i$ and follows i.i.d. complex Gaussian distribution as $\mathrm{vec}(\tilde{\mathbf{V}}_i) \sim \sigma_i^2\mathbf{I}_{N_i L_r}$.

The second stage requires two time slots, where at the first time slot the source nodes $\mathbb{S}_i$ transmits an $N_i \times L$ training signal matrix $\mathbf{X}_i$ to the relay node $\mathbb{R}$:

$$\mathbf{Y}_r = \mathbf{H}_{r1}\mathbf{X}_1 + \mathbf{H}_{r2}\mathbf{X}_2 + \mathbf{V}_r \tag{2}$$

where $\mathbf{Y}_r \in \mathbb{C}^{N_r \times L}$ is the received signal at the relay node $\mathbb{R}$, $\mathbf{H}_{ri} \in \mathbb{C}^{N_r \times N_i}$ is the forward channel from the source node $\mathbb{S}_i$ to the relay node $\mathbb{R}$. Similar to the backward channel $\mathbf{H}_{ir}$, we assume that $\mathbf{H}_{ri}$ is a correlated Rayleigh fading channel and satisfies the Gaussian-Kronecker model. Thus, $\mathbf{H}_{ri}$ is rewritten as $\mathbf{H}_{ri} = \mathbf{\Psi}_{ri}^{1/2}\mathbf{H}_{ri,u}\mathbf{\Phi}_{ri}^{1/2}$, where $\mathbf{\Psi}_{ri}$ is the receive correlation matrix and $\mathbf{\Phi}_{ri}$ is the transmit correlation matrix. $\mathbf{H}_{ri,u}$ is a complex Gaussian random matrix with i.i.d. zero mean and unit variance entries. $\mathbf{V}_r \in \mathbb{C}^{N_i \times L_r}$ is the noise at $\mathbb{R}$ with entries being i.i.d. complex Gaussian distribution with variance σ_r^2. Usually, the relay node $\mathbb{R}$ first scales the mixed signal with an amplifying factor and then retransmit the amplified signal. However, for simplicity but without loss of generality, the relay $\mathbb{R}$ only retransmits the mixed signal back to the source node $\mathbb{S}_i$ without performing amplification. Hence, the transmission model during the second time slot at the second stage is given by:

$$\mathbf{Y}_i = \mathbf{H}_{ir}\mathbf{H}_{r1}\mathbf{X}_1 + \mathbf{H}_{ir}\mathbf{H}_{r2}\mathbf{X}_2 + \mathbf{H}_{ir}\mathbf{V}_r + \mathbf{V}_i \tag{3}$$

where $\mathbf{Y}_i \in \mathbb{C}^{N_i \times L}$ is the received signal at the source node $\mathbb{S}_i$, $\mathbf{V}_i \in \mathbb{C}^{N_i \times L}$ is the i.i.d. Gaussian noise at $\mathbb{S}_i$ with variance σ_i^2.

III. Channel Estimation

A. LS Estimation for the Backward Channel

LS method assumes the deterministic scenario [3]. Due to the ease of the implementation, LS method is widely used in practice [12]. For the transmission model (1) at the first stage, by applying LS method, the estimator of $\mathbf{H}_{ir}$ is obtained:

$$\hat{\mathbf{H}}_{ir} = \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_i\mathbf{X}_R^H(\mathbf{X}_R\mathbf{X}_R^H)^{-1} \tag{4}$$

To analyze the estimation performance, the error of $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_{ir}$ is calculated:

$$\Delta\mathbf{H}_{ir} \triangleq \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{ir} - \mathbf{H}_{ir} = \tilde{\mathbf{V}}_i\mathbf{X}_R^H(\mathbf{X}_R\mathbf{X}_R^H)^{-1} \tag{5}$$

Before proceeding to derive the MSE of $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_{ir}$, the following lemma is useful in this paper:

Lemma 1 [9]: For $\mathrm{vec}(\mathbf{H}) \sim \mathcal{CN}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{\Theta} \otimes \mathbf{\Phi})$, there are $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{H}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{H}^H] = \mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{\Theta}^T)\mathbf{\Phi}$, $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{H}^H\mathbf{A}\mathbf{H}] = \mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{\Phi}\mathbf{A})\mathbf{\Theta}^T$.

Applying lemma 1 yields:

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\mathbb{E}[\Delta\mathbf{H}_{ir}\Delta\mathbf{H}_{ir}^H]) = N_i\mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{X}_R\mathbf{X}_R^H)^{-1} \tag{6}$$

The total transmission power at the relay node $\mathbb{R}$ is calculated and should satisfy the following:

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{X}_R\mathbf{X}_R^H) \le P_r \tag{7}$$

where P_r is the maximum total power constraint at the relay node. Hence, the optimization of $\mathbf{X}_R$ is formulated:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{X}_R} \quad & N_i\mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{X}_R\mathbf{X}_R^H)^{-1} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{X}_R\mathbf{X}_R^H) \le P_r \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Let an $N_r \times L_r$ matrix $\mathbf{\Xi}_R = [\mathbf{U}_R, \mathbf{0}]$, where the $N_r \times N_r$ matrix $\mathbf{U}_R$ is a unitary matrix. The solution to (8) is easily derived as:

$$\mathbf{X}_R = \sqrt{P_r/N_r}\mathbf{\Xi}_R \tag{9}$$

B. LMMSE Estimation for the Forward Channel

For the LMMSE method, the statistical channel scenario is assumed [3]. We first substitute $\mathbf{H}_{ir} = \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{ir} - \Delta\mathbf{H}_{ir}$ into (3), which yields:

$$\mathbf{Y}_i = \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{ir}\mathbf{H}_c\mathbf{P} + \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{ir}\mathbf{V}_r - \Delta\mathbf{H}_{ir}\mathbf{H}_c\mathbf{P} - \Delta\mathbf{H}_{ir}\mathbf{V}_r + \mathbf{V}_i \quad (10)$$

where $\mathbf{H}_c \triangleq [\mathbf{H}_{r1}^H, \mathbf{H}_{r2}^H]^H$ and $\mathbf{P} \triangleq [\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2]$.

By using the identity $\text{vec}(\mathbf{ABC}) = (\mathbf{C}^T \otimes \mathbf{A})\text{vec}(\mathbf{B})$, and defining $\mathbf{y}_i \triangleq \text{vec}(\mathbf{Y}_i)$,$\mathbf{v}_i \triangleq \text{vec}(\mathbf{V}_i)$,$\mathbf{v}_r \triangleq \text{vec}(\mathbf{V}_r)$, (10) can be reformulated:

$$\mathbf{y}_i = (\mathbf{P}^T \otimes \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{ir})\mathbf{h}_c + \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i \quad (11)$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i = (\mathbf{I}_L \otimes \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{ir})\mathbf{v}_r - (\mathbf{P}^T \otimes \Delta\mathbf{H}_{ir})\mathbf{h}_c - (\mathbf{I}_L \otimes \Delta\mathbf{H}_{ir})\mathbf{v}_r + \mathbf{v}_i$. Assuming the LMMSE matrix $\mathbf{G}_i$ is applied, i.e., $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_c = \mathbf{G}_i^H\mathbf{y}_i$, the MSE of the estimator $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_c$ is given as:

$$\text{MSE}_i = \text{Tr}\{\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{G}_i^H\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{h}_c)(\mathbf{G}_i^H\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{h}_c)^H\}. \quad (12)$$

Therefore, by taking derivative of the MSE with respect to $\mathbf{G}_i$, the LMMSE estimator of $\mathbf{h}_c$ is derived:

$$\hat{\mathbf{h}}_c = \mathbf{R}_{h_c y_i}\mathbf{R}_{y_i}^{-1}\mathbf{y}_i; \quad (13)$$

where $\mathbf{R}_{h_c y_i} \triangleq \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{h}_c\mathbf{y}_i^H) = \mathbf{R}_{h_c}(\mathbf{P}^* \otimes \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{ir}^H)$, $\mathbf{R}_{y_i} \triangleq \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{y}_i\mathbf{y}_i^H) = (\mathbf{P}^T \otimes \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{ir})\mathbf{R}_{h_c}(\mathbf{P}^* \otimes \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{ir}^H) + \mathbf{R}_{\tilde{v}_i}$, $\mathbf{R}_{h_c}$ and $\mathbf{R}_{\tilde{v}_i}$ are the covariance matrices of $\mathbf{h}_c$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i$ respectively. The estimation error $\Delta\mathbf{H}_{ir}$ is orthogonal to the backward channel $\mathbf{H}_{ir}$, i.e., $\mathbb{E}(\Delta\mathbf{H}_{ir}\mathbf{H}_{ir}) = \mathbf{0}$, which is used to calculate $\mathbf{R}_{h_c y_i}$ and $\mathbf{R}_{y_i}$. $\mathbf{R}_{h_c}$ are further derived to be:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{R}_{h_c} =& \mathbb{E}(\begin{bmatrix} \text{vec}(\mathbf{H}_{r1}) \\ \text{vec}(\mathbf{H}_{r2}) \end{bmatrix}[\text{vec}(\mathbf{H}_{r1})^H, \text{vec}(\mathbf{H}_{r2})^H]) \\ =& blkdiag\{\mathbf{\Phi}_{r1} \otimes \mathbf{\Psi}_{r1}, \mathbf{\Phi}_{r2} \otimes \mathbf{\Psi}_{r2}\}\end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

For the derivation of $\mathbf{R}_{\tilde{v}_i}$, it should be noted that (5) can be rewritten into $\Delta\mathbf{H}_{ir} = (N_r/P_r)\tilde{\mathbf{V}}_i\mathbf{\Xi}_R^H$, hence $\Delta\mathbf{H}_{ir}$ follows the complex Gaussian distribution, i.e., $\text{vec}(\Delta\mathbf{H}_{ir}) \sim \mathcal{CN}(\mathbf{0}, \frac{\sigma_i^2 N_r}{P_r}\mathbf{I}_{N_i N_r})$. Therefore, $\mathbf{R}_{\tilde{v}_i}$ is further calculated as:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{R}_{\tilde{v}_i} =& \sigma_r^2(\mathbf{I}_L \otimes \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{ir})(\mathbf{I}_L \otimes \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{ir}^H) + \mathbb{E}\{ \\ & (\mathbf{P}^T \otimes \Delta\mathbf{H}_{ir})\mathbf{R}_{h_c}(\mathbf{P}^* \otimes \Delta\mathbf{H}_{ir}^H)\} + \sigma_{\tilde{i}}^2\mathbf{I}_{N_i L}\end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where $\sigma_{\tilde{i}}^2 = \sigma_i^2 + \frac{\sigma_i^2\sigma_r^2 N_r^2}{P_r}$. Meanwhile, since $\text{vec}(\Delta\mathbf{H}_{ir}) \sim \mathcal{CN}(\mathbf{0}, \frac{\sigma_i^2 N_r}{P_r}\mathbf{I}_{N_i N_r})$, Lemma 1 is applied to derive the seconde term of (15). Noted that the identity $(\mathbf{A} \otimes \mathbf{B})(\mathbf{C} \otimes \mathbf{D}) = \mathbf{AC} \otimes \mathbf{BD}$ is useful to further calculate the compact form of $\mathbf{R}_{\tilde{v}_i}$:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{R}_{\tilde{v}_i} =& \sigma_r^2\mathbf{I}_L \otimes \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{ir}\hat{\mathbf{H}}_{ir}^H + \sigma_{\tilde{i}}^2\mathbf{I}_{N_i L} + \\ & \sum_{k=1}^{2}\frac{\text{Tr}(\mathbf{\Phi}_{rk})\sigma_i^2 N_r}{P_r}(\mathbf{X}_k^T\mathbf{\Phi}_{rk}\mathbf{X}_k^*) \otimes \mathbf{I}_{N_i}\end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

IV. Training Signal Design at Stage Two

We have derived the two-stage channel estimation scheme, we next consider the criterion for the optimal training signal design. In most optimal training signal designs, the sum MSE has been choosen as the criterion [3], [8] and [9]. Cramer-ráo Lower Bound criterion for optimal training sequences have been provided in [13]. However, in our case, due to the nonlinearity in MSE of the forward channel estimator, the tractable analytical expression of the MSE cannot be formulated. Hence, we seek to minimize the upper bound of the approximated conditional MSE of the forward channel estimator, which is conditioned on the given estimated backward channel estimator.

Substituting $\mathbf{G}_i^H = \mathbf{R}_{h_c y_i}\mathbf{R}_{y_i}^{-1}$ into (12) and appplying the well-known Woodbury matrix identity $(\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{UCV})^{-1} = \mathbf{A}^{-1} - \mathbf{A}^{-1}\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{C}^{-1} + \mathbf{VA}^{-1}\mathbf{U})^{-1}\mathbf{VA}^{-1}$, (12) can be rewritten into a compact form:

$$\text{MSE}_i = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{R}_{h_c}^{-1} + \mathbf{M}_i^H\mathbf{R}_{\tilde{v}_i}^{-1}\mathbf{M}_i)^{-1} \quad (17)$$

where we define $\mathbf{M}_i \triangleq \mathbf{P}^T \otimes \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{ir}$. Note that the expectation is taken with respect to the random matrices $\mathbf{h}_c$, $\Delta\mathbf{H}_{ir}$, $\mathbf{V}_i$ and $\mathbf{V}_r$. Therefore, the MSE of the estimator $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_c$ is conditioned on the estimated $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_{ir}$.

Let us introduce the matrix $\bar{\mathbf{R}}_{\tilde{v}_i} \triangleq \sigma_r^2\mathbf{I}_L \otimes \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{ir}\hat{\mathbf{H}}_{ir}^H + \sigma_{\tilde{i}}^2\mathbf{I}_{N_i L}$. For any two matrices $\mathbf{A} \succ \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{B} \succ \mathbf{0}$, if $\mathbf{A} \succ \mathbf{B}$, then $\mathbf{D}^H\mathbf{AD} \succ \mathbf{D}^H\mathbf{BD}$. Also, for any two matrices $\mathbf{A} \succ \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{B} \succ \mathbf{0}$, if $\mathbf{A} \succ \mathbf{B}$, then $\mathbf{A}^{-1} \prec \mathbf{B}^{-1}$. Subsequently, $\mathbf{R}_{\tilde{v}_i} \succ \bar{\mathbf{R}}_{\tilde{v}_i}$ leads to $\mathbf{M}_i^H\mathbf{R}_{\tilde{v}_i}^{-1}\mathbf{M}_i \prec \mathbf{M}_i^H\bar{\mathbf{R}}_{\tilde{v}_i}^{-1}\mathbf{M}_i$. Thus, we have:

$$\text{MSE}_i > \text{Tr}(\mathbf{R}_{h_c}^{-1} + \mathbf{M}_i^H\bar{\mathbf{R}}_{\tilde{v}_i}^{-1}\mathbf{M}_i)^{-1} \quad (18)$$

In (15), it should be noted that under the assumption that the relay total transmission power is large enough, we have the following asymptotic formula:

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{P_r \to \infty}\mathbf{R}_{\tilde{v}_i} =& \lim_{P_r \to \infty}\sum_{k=1}^{2}\frac{\text{Tr}(\mathbf{\Phi}_{rk})\sigma_i^2 N_r}{P_r}(\mathbf{X}_k^T\mathbf{\Phi}_{rk}\mathbf{X}_k^*) \otimes \mathbf{I}_{N_i} \\ & + \bar{\mathbf{R}}_{\tilde{v}_i} = \bar{\mathbf{R}}_{\tilde{v}_i}.\end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Subsequently, the following approximation is further calculated:

$$\text{MSE}_i \approx \text{Tr}(\mathbf{R}_{h_c}^{-1} + \mathbf{M}_i^H\bar{\mathbf{R}}_{\tilde{v}_i}^{-1}\mathbf{M}_i)^{-1} \quad (20)$$

Let us denote $\text{MSE}_i^{(a)} = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{R}_{h_c}^{-1} + \mathbf{M}_i^H\bar{\mathbf{R}}_{\tilde{v}_i}^{-1}\mathbf{M}_i)^{-1}$, the optimization problem is therefore formulated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\min_{\mathbf{X}_k, k=1,2} \quad & \text{MSE}_1^{(a)} + \text{MSE}_2^{(a)} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \text{Tr}(\mathbf{X}_k\mathbf{X}_k^H) \le P_k, k = 1, 2\end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

For any two nonsingular matrices $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{B}$, they satisfy $(\mathbf{A} \otimes \mathbf{B})^{-1} = \mathbf{A}^{-1} \otimes \mathbf{B}^{-1}$. To simplify the optimization problem in (21), we rewrite $\text{MSE}_i^{(a)}$ as:

$$\text{MSE}_i^{(a)} = \text{Tr}(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{1,1}^{(i)} + \mathbf{\Phi}_{r1}^{-1} \otimes \mathbf{\Psi}_{r1}^{-1} & \mathbf{\Sigma}_{1,2}^{(i)} \\ \mathbf{\Sigma}_{2,1}^{(i)} & \mathbf{\Sigma}_{2,2}^{(i)} + \mathbf{\Phi}_{r2}^{-1} \otimes \mathbf{\Psi}_{r2}^{-1} \end{bmatrix})^{-1} \quad (22)$$

where $\mathbf{\Sigma}_{p,q}^{(i)} = \sigma_r^{-2}\mathbf{X}_p^*\mathbf{X}_q^T \otimes \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{ir}^H(\sigma_i^2\mathbf{I}_{N_i} + \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{ir}\hat{\mathbf{H}}_{ir}^H)^{-1}\hat{\mathbf{H}}_{ir}$, $p,q \in \{1,2\}$. From (22), it can be verified that to minimize the objective function in the optimization problem (21), the training signals should first satisfy:

$$\mathbf{X}_1\mathbf{X}_2^H = \mathbf{0}. \tag{23}$$

Subsequently, (22) can be rewritten into

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{MSE}_i^{(a)} = &\sum_{k=1}^{2}\mathrm{Tr}\{\sigma_r^{-2}\mathbf{X}_k^*\mathbf{X}_k^T \otimes \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{ir}^H(\sigma_i^2\mathbf{I}_{N_i}+ \\ &\hat{\mathbf{H}}_{ir}\hat{\mathbf{H}}_{ir}^H)^{-1}\hat{\mathbf{H}}_{ir} + \mathbf{\Phi}_{rk}^{-1} \otimes \mathbf{\Psi}_{rk}^{-1}\}^{-1}\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Let us introduce the following eigenvalue decomposition:

$$\mathbf{\Phi}_{rk} = \mathbf{U}_{\Phi_{rk}}\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\Phi_{rk}}\mathbf{U}_{\Phi_{rk}}^H. \tag{25}$$

$$\mathbf{\Psi}_{rk} = \mathbf{U}_{\Psi_{rk}}\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\Psi_{rk}}\mathbf{U}_{\Psi_{rk}}^H. \tag{26}$$

Substituting (25) and (26) into (24) and letting $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_k = \mathbf{U}_{\Phi_{rk}}^H\mathbf{X}_k^*$ yields:

$$\mathrm{MSE}_i^{(a)} = \sum_{k=1}^{2}\mathrm{Tr}\{\sigma_r^{-2}\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_k\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_k^H \otimes \mathbf{E}_i + \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\Phi_{rk}}^{-1} \otimes \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\Psi_{rk}}^{-1}\}^{-1} \tag{27}$$

Define $\mathbf{\Xi} \triangleq [\mathbf{\Xi}_1^H, \mathbf{\Xi}_2^H]^H \in \mathbb{C}^{(N_1+N_2)\times L}$, let $\mathbf{\Xi} = [\mathbf{U}_F, \mathbf{0}]$, where $\mathbf{\Xi}_1 \in \mathbb{C}^{(N_1\times L)}$ and $\mathbf{\Xi}_2 \in \mathbb{C}^{(N_2\times L)}$ are submatrices of $\mathbf{\Xi}$, $\mathbf{U}_F \in \mathbb{C}^{(N_1+N_2)\times(N_1+N_2)}$ is a unitary matrix. From (27), with the assistance of the eigenvalue decomposition of $\mathbf{\Phi}_{rk}$, we propose an immmediate choice of $\mathbf{X}_k$ to diagonalize $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_k\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_k^H$:

$$\mathbf{X}_k = \mathbf{U}_{\Phi_{rk}}^*\mathbf{\Lambda}_k^{\frac{*}{2}}\mathbf{\Xi}_k^* \tag{28}$$

where $\mathbf{\Lambda}_k$ is a diagonal matrix with diagonal elements $\{\gamma_{k,s}\}_{s=1}^{N_k}$. For simplicity of the optimization, we derive the following lemma to obtain the upper bound $\mathrm{MSE}_i^{(U)}$ on $\mathrm{MSE}_i^{(a)}$.

Lemma 2: An upper bound of $\mathrm{MSE}_i^{(a)}$ is given by:

$$\mathrm{MSE}_i^{(a)} < \mathrm{MSE}_i^{(U)}. \tag{29}$$

where $\mathrm{MSE}_i^{(U)} = \sum_{k=1}^{2}\mathrm{Tr}\{\sigma_r^{-2}\mathbf{\Lambda}_k \otimes \mathbf{D}_{\tilde{E}_i} + \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\Phi_{rk}}^{-1} \otimes \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\Psi_{rk}}^{-1}\}^{-1}$, and $\mathbf{D}_{\tilde{E}_i}$ is a diagonal matrix which contains the diagonal elements of $\mathbf{E}_i^{-1}$.

Proof: Using the Woodbury matrix identity:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{MSE}_i^{(a)} &= \sum_{k=1}^{2}\mathrm{Tr}\{\sigma_r^{-2}\mathbf{\Lambda}_k \otimes \mathbf{E}_i + \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\Phi_{rk}}^{-1} \otimes \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\Psi_{rk}}^{-1}\}^{-1} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{2}\mathrm{Tr}\{\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\Phi_{rk}} \otimes \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\Psi_{rk}} - (\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\Phi_{rk}} \otimes \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\Psi_{rk}})\cdot \\ &\quad (\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\Phi_{rk}} \otimes \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\Psi_{rk}} + \mathbf{\Lambda}_k \otimes \mathbf{E}_i^{-1})^{-1}\cdot \\ &\quad (\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\Phi_{rk}} \otimes \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\Psi_{rk}})\}\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

Since for any $N \times N$ positive definite matrix $\mathbf{A}$, it satisfies $\mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{A}^{-1}) \geq \sum_{p=1}^{N}[\mathbf{A}(p,p)^{-1}]$, where $\mathbf{A}(p,q)$ means the $(p,q)^{th}$ element of $\mathbf{A}$. Hence, for (30), we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{MSE}_i^{(a)} < &\sum_{k=1}^{2}\mathrm{Tr}\{\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\Phi_{rk}} \otimes \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\Psi_{rk}} - (\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\Phi_{rk}} \otimes \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\Psi_{rk}})\cdot \\ &(\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\Phi_{rk}} \otimes \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\Psi_{rk}} + \mathbf{\Lambda}_k \otimes \mathbf{D}_{\tilde{E}_i})^{-1}\cdot \\ &(\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\Phi_{rk}} \otimes \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\Psi_{rk}})\} \\ = &\sum_{k=1}^{2}\mathrm{Tr}\{\sigma_r^{-2}\mathbf{\Lambda}_k \otimes \mathbf{D}_{\tilde{E}_i} + \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\Phi_{rk}}^{-1} \otimes \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\Psi_{rk}}^{-1}\}^{-1}\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

Thus, Lemma 2 is proven.

According to the discussion above, the relaxed optimization problem is formulated as:

$$\begin{aligned}\min_{\mathbf{X}_k, k=1,2} \quad &\mathrm{MSE}_1^{(U)} + \mathrm{MSE}_2^{(U)} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad &\mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{X}_k\mathbf{X}_k^H) \leq P_k, k = 1,2\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

It should be noted that in traditional optimal training signal designs, the relay power constraint is taken into account for the optimization while the study [8] only considers the source power constraint. In this paper, since we assume that the relay transmission power is large enough, we only consider the power constraint at the source node. Subsequently, the optimization problem (32) is easily written in scalar form as:

$$\min_{\gamma_{k,s}} \quad J = \sum_{i=1}^{2}\sum_{k=1}^{2}\sum_{s=1}^{N_k}\sum_{l=1}^{N_r}(\sigma_r^{-2}\lambda_{k,s}^{-1}\sigma_{k,l}^{-1} + \gamma_{k,s}\delta_{k,l}^{(i)})^{-1} \tag{33}$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{s=1}^{N_k}\gamma_{k,s} \leq P_k, k = 1,2 \tag{34}$$

$$\gamma_{k,s} \geq 0, \quad k = 1,2, s = 1,2,\ldots,N_k \tag{35}$$

where $\{\lambda_{k,s}\}_{s=1}^{N_k}$, $\{\sigma_{k,l}\}_{l=1}^{N_r}$ and $\{\delta_{k,l}^{(i)}\}_{l=1}^{N_r}$ are the diagonal elements of the matrices $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\Phi_{rk}}$, $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\Psi_{rk}}$ and $\mathbf{D}_{\tilde{E}_i}$ respectively. For the optimization variable $\gamma_{k,s}$, by verifying the second-order derivative is greater than zero:

$$\frac{\partial^2 J}{\partial\gamma_{k,s}^2} = \sum_{i=1}^{2}\sum_{l=1}^{N_r}\frac{2[\delta_{k,l}^{(i)}]^2\sigma_r^{-4}}{(\sigma_r^{-2}\lambda_{k,s}^{-1}\sigma_{k,l}^{-1} + \gamma_{k,s}\delta_{k,l}^{(i)})^3} > 0. \tag{36}$$

the objective function (33) is therefore a convex function with respect to $\gamma_{k,s}$. Moreover, the power constraints (34) can be rewritten in linear inequality form, i.e., $\mathbf{1}^T\boldsymbol{\gamma}_k \leq P_k$, where $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_k \triangleq [\gamma_{k,1}, \gamma_{k,2}, \ldots, \gamma_{k,N_k}]^T$, hence, the problem (33)-(35) is verified to be a convex optimization problem with respect to $\gamma_{k,s}$. Subsequently, the Lagrange function is derived:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L} = &\sum_{i=1}^{2}\sum_{k=1}^{2}\sum_{s=1}^{N_k}\sum_{l=1}^{N_r}(\sigma_r^{-2}\lambda_{k,s}^{-1}\sigma_{k,l}^{-1} + \gamma_{k,s}\delta_{k,l}^{(i)})^{-1} \\ &+ \sum_{k=1}^{2}\mu_k(\sum_{s=1}^{N_k}\gamma_{k,s} - P_k) - \sum_{k=1}^{2}\sum_{s=1}^{N_k}\nu_{k,s}\gamma_{k,s}.\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

$\gamma_{k,s}$ can be efficiently obtained through the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) optimality conditions and the gradient condition

is given by:

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \gamma_{k,s}} = -\sum_{i=1}^{2}\sum_{l=1}^{N_r} \frac{\delta_{k,l}^{(i)}\sigma_r^{-2}}{(\sigma_r^{-2}\lambda_{k,s}^{-1}\sigma_{k,l}^{-1} + \gamma_{k,s}\delta_{k,l}^{(i)})^2} + \mu_k = 0,$$
$$k = 1, 2, s = 1, 2, \ldots, N_k \tag{38}$$

where μ_k and ν_k are the Lagrange multipliers satisfying the complementary slackness conditions given by:

$$\mu_k(\sum_{s=1}^{N_k}\gamma_{k,s} - P_k) = 0, \tag{39}$$
$$\nu_{k,s}\gamma_{k,s} = 0, k = 1, 2, s = 1, 2, \ldots, N_k. \tag{40}$$

Note that in (38), the left hand side (LHS) is monotonically decreasing function with respect to the positive $\gamma_{k,s}$, which can be obtained by using bisection search. Similarly, note the LHS in (34), since $\gamma_{k,s}$ is monotonically decreasing function of μ_k, an outer loop bisection search is applied to efficiently find the optimal μ_k. The two-loop bisection search algorithm to find the solution to the optimizaiton problem (33)-(35) consists of the following two major steps:

1. Initialization: Initialize $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_k, k = 1, 2$ to meet the power constraint (34) as $\gamma_{k,s}^{(0)} = \sqrt{\frac{P_k}{N_k}}$. Let $f_{k,s} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \gamma_{k,s}}$, set a feasible search region for μ_k and $\gamma_{k,s}$ to be $[\underline{\mu_k}, \overline{\mu_k}]$ and $[\underline{\gamma_{k,s}}, \overline{\gamma_{k,s}}]$.

2. Bisection Search on μ_k and $\gamma_{k,s}$:
while $|\mu_k^{(t+1)} - \mu_k^{(t)}| > \epsilon_1$ or $t = t_{max1}$
set $\mu_k^{(t+1)} = \frac{\underline{\mu_k} + \overline{\mu_k}}{2}$,

while $|\gamma_{k,s}^{(t+1)} - \gamma_{k,s}^{(t)}| > \epsilon_2$ or $t = t_{max2}$.
set $\gamma_{k,s}^{(t+1)} = \frac{\underline{\gamma_{k,s}} + \overline{\gamma_{k,s}}}{2}$.
If $f_{k,s} \leq 0$, then $\overline{\gamma_{k,s}} = \gamma_{k,s}^{(t+1)}$ else if $f_{k,s} > 0$, then $\underline{\gamma_{k,s}} = \gamma_{k,s}^{(t+1)}$.
end while for bisection on $\gamma_{k,s}$.

If $\sum_{s=1}^{N_k}\gamma_{k,s}^{(t+1)} - P_k \leq 0$, then $\overline{\mu_k} = \mu_k^{(t+1)}$ else $\underline{\mu_k} = \mu_k^{(t+1)}$.
end while for bisection on μ_k.

V. Numerical Results

In this section, we evaluate the performance of the two-stage channel estimation for individual channels through numerical results. We consider a two-way MIMO relay system, where the source nodes are equipped with the same number of antennas and there is a single antenna at relay node, i.e., $N_i = N_r = 4, i = 1, 2$. We adopt the correlated channel, where the channel covariance matrices are generated by employing Bessel function [8]. The $(p, q)^{th}$ element of $\boldsymbol{\Psi}_{ir}$, $\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{ir}$, $\boldsymbol{\Psi}_{ri}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{ri}$ are generated by $\boldsymbol{\Psi}_{ir}(p, q) = \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{ri}(p, q) = J_0(2\pi\frac{d_i}{\lambda}|p - q|)$, $\boldsymbol{\Psi}_{ri}(p, q) = \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{ir}(p, q) = J_0(2\pi\frac{d_r}{\lambda}|p - q|)$, where J_0 is the zeroth-order Bessel function of the first kind, λ is the carrier wavelength, and d_i and d_r are the antenna element spacing at $\mathbb{S}_i$ and $\mathbb{R}$ respectively [8]. For simplicity but without loss of generality, the noise at all nodes have unit variance, i.e., $\sigma_r^2 = \sigma_i^2 = 1$. For the training signals at both the first stage and the second stage, we use the shortest length training signals, i.e., $L_r = N_r, L = N_1 + N_2$. We also assume the source training signals have the same transmission power. The ratio of transmission power to unit power is denoted as P (dB). In particular, we use the normalized DFT matrix to be the unitary matrix for the training signals at stage 1 and stage 2, i.e., $\mathbf{U}_R(p, q) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N_r}}\exp(-j\frac{2\pi pq}{N_r})$, $\mathbf{U}_F(p, q) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2N}}\exp(-j\frac{2\pi pq}{2N})$. The average normalized MSE of both backward channel and forward channel estimation are calculated respectively through Monte Carlo, which averages over 10^3 channel realizations. Without loss of generality, we consider the backward channel and forward channel estimated at source node $\mathbb{S}_1$.


MSE of the backward channel estimator
Relay power to unit ratio Pr (dB)
Optimal Training Signal−Case I
Non−optimal Training Signal−Case I
Optimal Training Signal−Case II
Non−optimal Training Signal−Case II

Fig. 2. Backward channel estimation at the first stage.

In the first example as is shown in Fig.2, we compare the performance of LS channel estimation at the first stage. The proposed optimal training signal, which is also orthogonal training signal, and the diagonal training signal are applied respectively. The diagonal training signal is denoted as: $\mathbf{X}_{R,diag} = \mathbf{D}_r\boldsymbol{\Xi}_R$, where $\mathbf{D}_R$ is a diagonal matrix consists of diagonal elements $\{d_{r,n}\}_{n=1}^{N_r}$. Besides, it satisfies $\sum_{n=1}^{Nr} d_{r,n} = P_r$, which means that the total transmission power reaches the maximum relay power. The correlated channel parameters are set as: (1). $\frac{d_i}{\lambda} = 0.05, i = 1, 2$ and $\frac{d_r}{\lambda} = 0.25$. Therefore, all channels are strongly correlated [8]. (2). $\frac{d_1}{\lambda} = \frac{d_r}{\lambda} = 0.25, \frac{d_2}{\lambda} = 0.05$. Thus, the channel estimation schemes are performed under weakly correlated $\mathbb{S}_1 - \mathbb{R}$ channel and strongly correlated $\mathbb{S}_2 - \mathbb{R}$ channel. The numerical result shows that the optimal training signal performs better than the diagonal training signal, which matches the theory. It also shows that LS scheme under the correlated channel case I outperforms than that under case II.

In the second example, we evaluate the performance of the proposed training signal as is shown in Fig.3. Meanwhile, the diagonal training signal which is denoted as: $\mathbf{X}_{k,diag} =$


Proposed Training Signal
Diagonal Training Signal
Orthogonal Training Signal
MSE of the forward channel estimator
Source power to unit ratio P (dB)

Fig. 3. Forward channel estimation under all strongly correlated channels at the second stage.


Proposed Training Signal
Diagonal Training Signal
Orthogonal Training Signal
MSE of the forward channel estimator
Source power to unit ratio P (dB)

Fig. 4. Forward channel estimation under weakly correlated $\mathbb{S}_1 - \mathbb{R}$ and strongly correlated $\mathbb{S}_2 - \mathbb{R}$ channel at the second stage.

$\mathbf{\Lambda}_k \mathbf{\Xi}_k$, and the orthogonal training signal, which is signified as: $\mathbf{X}_{k,orth} = \sqrt{\frac{P_k}{N_k}} \mathbf{\Xi}_k$ are applied for the comparison. The channel estimation scheme is performed under the correlated channel, where the channel parameters are set as: $\frac{d_i}{\lambda} = 0.05, i = 1, 2$ and $\frac{d_r}{\lambda} = 0.25$. The numerical result shows that the proposed training schemes performs the best among the three training schemes. Moreover, the difference between the MSEs of diagonal and orthogonal training schemes tends to be smaller in high P region.

In the last example as is shown in Fig.4, the parameters of the correlated channels are set as: $\frac{d_1}{\lambda} = \frac{d_r}{\lambda} = 0.25, \frac{d_2}{\lambda} = 0.05$. The proposed training, diagonal training $\mathbf{X}_{k,diag}$ and orthogonal training $\mathbf{X}_{k,orth}$ are applied. It shows that the proposed training scheme performs better than other schemes. Moreover, In low P region, the proposed training scheme outperforms other schemes more than 1dB. It also shows that the estimation scheme for the case of weakly correlated $\mathbb{S}_1 - \mathbb{R}$ channel and strongly correlated $\mathbb{S}_2 - \mathbb{R}$ channel outperforms than that of all strongly correlated channels.

VI. Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a novel training signal scheme for the two-stage channel estimation in two-way MIMO relay systems. We first derive the backward channel estimator at the first stage, then given the estimated backward channel and the prior knowledge of the estimator error, the forward channel estimator and the related training signal are proposed. In numerical results, we consider the two correlated channel scenarios: (1). All strongly correlated channels; (2). Weakly correlated $\mathbb{S}_1 - \mathbb{R}$ and strongly correlated $\mathbb{S}_2 - \mathbb{R}$ channel. It is shown that under both scenarios, the proposed training signal improves the channel estimation MSE performance, while the MSE performance under scenario (2) is better than that under scenario (1).

References

[1] L. A. Scaglione, D. L. Goeckel, and J. N. Laneman, "Cooperative communications in mobile Ad Hoc networks,"*IEEE Signal Process. Mag.*, vol. 23, no. 5, pp. 18-29, Sep. 2006.

[2] I. E. Telatar, "Capacity of multi-antenna Gaussian channels, *Eur. Trans. Telecommun.*, vol. 10, pp. 585-595, Nov. 1999.

[3] F. Gao, T. Cui, and A. Nallanathan, "On channel estimation and optimal training design for amplify and forward relay networks,"*IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 7, no. 5, pp. 1907-1916, May 2008.

[4] P. Lioliou, M. Viberg, and M. Matthaiou, "Bayesian approach to channel estimation for AF MIMO relaying systems,"*IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 30, no. 8, pp. 1440-1451, Sep. 2012.

[5] D. Qin, Z. Ding, and S. DasGupta, "On forward channel estimation for mimo precoding in cooperative relay wireless transmission systems,"*IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 62, no. 5, pp. 1265-1278, March 2014.

[6] Y. Jing and X. Yu, "ML-Based Channel Estimations for Non-Regenerative Relay Networks with Multiple Transmit and Receive Antennas,"*IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 30, no. 8, pp. 1428-1439, Sep. 2012.

[7] A. Scaglione, P. Stoica, S. Barbarossa, G. B. Giannakis, and H. Sampath, "Optimal designs for space-time linear precoders and decoders,"*IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 50, no. 5, pp. 1051-1064, May 2002.

[8] D.-H. Kim, M. Ju, and H.-M. Kim, "Optimal training signal design for estimation of correlated MIMO channels in two-way amplify and-forward relay systems,"*IEEE Commun. Lett.*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 491-494, Mar. 2013.

[9] C. W. R. Chiong, Y. Rong, and Y. Xiang, "Channel Training Algorithms for Two-Way MIMO Relay Systems,"*IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 61, no. 16, pp. 3988 - 3998, Aug. 2013.

[10] X. Xie, M. Peng, B. Zhao, W. Wang, and Y. Hua, "Maximum a posteriori based channel estimation strategy for two-way relaying channels,"*IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 450-463, Jan. 2014.

[11] D. S. Shiu, G. Foschini, M. Gans, and J. Kahn, "Fading correlation and its effect on the capacity of multielement antenna systems,"*IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 48, pp. 503-513, Mar. 2000.

[12] S. M. Kay, *Fundamentals of Statistical Signal Processing: Estimation Theory.* Englewood Cilffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1993.

[13] F. Gao, T. Cui, and A. Nallanathan, "Optimal training design for channel estimation in decode-and-forward relay networks with individual and total power constraints,"*IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 56, no. 12, pp. 5937-5949, Dec. 2008.